

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 4-30, 32-55 and 57-65 remain pending in the application. By this Amendment After Final Rejection, claims 1, 2 and 26 are amended; and claims 3, 31 and 56 are canceled.

In numbered paragraph 7, page 5 of the final Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 11-21, 27, 39-49 and 59 are allowed.

In numbered paragraph 6, page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 3-10, 31-38, 56, 57, 60, 61, 62 and 64 contain allowable subject matter. In response, features of allowable claim 3 have been incorporated in claims 1 and 26, without incorporating claim 2. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 26 are patentably distinct.

In numbered paragraph 2, page 3 of the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 26, along with various dependent claims, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Chen et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,919). In numbered paragraph 3, page 3 of the Office Action, dependent claims 63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Chen et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Chen et al. patent does not teach or suggest correcting a frame of image data using a set of correction coefficients corresponding to detector elements of a detector array used to collect the frame of image as recited in claims 1 and 26. The Examiner admitted at paragraph 6 of the Office Action that this feature, previously recited in claim 3, is allowable.

At least for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 26, along with the respective dependent claims, including dependent claims 63 and 65, are allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In numbered paragraph 4, page 4 of the Office Action, independent claims 22 and 28, along with various dependent claims, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,269,195 (Gonsalves et al.). In numbered paragraph 5, page 4 of the Office Action, dependent claims 24, 25, 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Gonsalves et al. patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have disclosed a method and apparatus for approximating a Gaussian-blur filter by applying a first box filter and a second box filter (e.g., specification at paragraph [0006]). The claimed box filters encompass the disclosed 2-dimensional box filters (e.g., specification at paragraphs [0052] and [0063]-[0067]).

Claim 22 recites a method of approximating a Gaussian-blur filter, comprising applying a first box filter having a first kernel size to a group of pixels of a frame of image data. The method also comprises applying a second box filter having a second kernel size to the group of pixels, wherein first kernel coefficients for the first box filter and second kernel coefficients for the second box filter are configured to approximate a resultant Gaussian function. Claim 28 similarly recites an apparatus for approximating a gaussian-blur filter, comprising a processor unit coupled to a data source, the processor unit being configured to apply a first box filter having a first kernel size to a group of pixels of a frame of data, and apply a second box filter having a second kernel size to the group of pixels, wherein first kernel coefficients of

the first box filter and second kernel coefficients of the second box filter are configured to approximate a resultant gaussian function.

In numbered paragraph 1(c), page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner replies, "[t]he examiner disagrees. Gonsalves teaches a method and an apparatus of approximating a Gaussian-blur filter,..." Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertions. Applicants respectfully submit that the Gonsalves et al. does not teach or suggest approximating a Gaussian-blur filter by applying first and second box filters as recited in claims 22 and 28.

The Examiner relies upon steps 84 and 86 illustrated in Figure 6 of the Gonsalves et al. patent and column 2, lines 9-18 for allegedly disclosing the claim subject matter. However, column 2, lines 9-18 discloses a single-dimensional filter having a true Gaussian function (shown in Fig. 4) for each of the horizontal and vertical directions (col. 2, lines 9-18). Single-dimensional filters having a true Gaussian function as disclosed by the Gonsalves et al. patent does not teach or suggest the claimed first and second box filters. Further, the box filters as claimed encompass Applicants' disclosed 2-dimensional box filters with computationally streamlined approximation for enhanced signal processing. At least for the above reasons, the pair of directional single-dimensional filters having a true Gaussian function as disclosed by the Gonsalves et al. does not teach or suggest approximating a Gaussian-blur filter, and does not teach or suggest applying first and second box filters as recited in claims 22 and 28.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants' claims 1, 11, 22, 26, 27 and 28 are allowable. The remaining claims depend from the respective independent claims and recite additional advantageous features which further distinguish over the

documents relied upon by the Examiner. As such, the present application is considered in condition for allowance.

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the objections and rejections of record are respectfully requested so that the present application may pass to issuance.


Should there be any questions in connection with this application, the Office is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: May 20, 2005

By:

  
Reg. No. 48,360

Patrick C. Keane

Registration No. 32,858

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620